

From: Mark A. Clawson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/21/02 1:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I have been using and programming computers since the early 80s. During that time I've seen many hardware and software companies rise and fall. Sadly, in my opinion, I have seen too many companies develop great products and have Microsoft come to them and "learn" from them but in reality steal their code and ideas. Take a look at the litigation Microsoft has undergone to see what I mean. Microsoft has no qualms about stealing someone's code and then justifying the theft with a settlement. Even the well publicized \$150 million "invested" in Apple was in reality a payoff for pending patent litigation.

Microsoft will never propose any settlement that does not permit them to continue doing what they have always done. Their current proposal would do the unthinkable, give them a leg up in a market area where they currently do not dominate. By donating "refurbished PCs" (read leftover machines after upgrading in-house) and software (read their software, which costs a small fraction to make in comparison to what it retails for) Microsoft gives a surface level display of remorse that in reality furthers its own agenda. A more adequate requirement would have Microsoft spend the \$1 billion on new machines that did not run their operating system, such as Linux or Macintoshes. The findings of fact are clear. Do not reward Microsoft for monopolistic behavior. Microsoft will continue to practice business the same way they always have until you tell them they can't, and back it up with sufficient muscle to force them to change the way they do business. Any remedy that doesn't hurt them is no remedy at all.

Mark Clawson
Clearfield, UT